

**Traffic Safety Advisory Committee**  
**June 16, 2008**  
**Minutes**

Present: Chief Douglas - Chairman  
Bill Parker  
Bob Courage  
Bill Ruoff  
Kevin Lynch  
Gil Archambault  
Mike Putnam, Board of Selectman representative

Absent: Dave Wheeler

Kathryn Parenti, Recording Secretary

1. Roll Call vote required by the BOS.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

2. Discussion: *Request from the Board of Selectmen regarding Middle and Putnam Streets.*

F. Douglas began by stating this item was back on the agenda because they did not want to rush the discussion at the last meeting. There were three options to discuss and before the last meeting, he and B. Ruoff had discussed, and B. Ruoff had no issues with, the placement of a stop sign on a tear drop at the intersection.

B. Ruoff stated the way to deal with that intersection is by adding a teardrop with a stop sign to extend the stop sign further out.

B. Parker, referring to the photograph including in the meeting packet, stated the bump out is shown on the picture along with the ninety (90) degree parking that was the preference of the BOS the last time this was presented. The existing crosswalk would remain as it is.

M. Putnam stated the BOS was concerned with the angled parking at the last meeting because of a possible traffic flow problem with cars looking to park when headed east on Middle Street. He also stated they were not in favor of a stop sign on Middle Street.

B. Parker replied they had talked about the stop sign on Middle Street and the consensus of the Committee was that they did not want to add a stop sign on Middle Street.

F. Douglas noted that currently, someone pulling out onto Middle Street can not see in either direction to pull out.

B. Ruoff stated if they move the sign out a bit and shift the parking to allow for a bump out on the other side, it would make for better sight alignment.

F. Douglas stated with the bump out and stop bar, they would provide better visibility looking toward Nashua Street and it would be less intrusive than adding a stop sign in the middle of Middle Street.

G. Archambault noted he and Chief Douglas had done a survey at that location several months ago and they had come to the same conclusion with the exception of making the first three (3) parking spaces angled parking.

F. Douglas responded that the angled spaces would not be a good idea; the straight in parking spaces would interfere with the access of the angled parking.

F. Douglas proposed Option III (compact cars) from the handout be eliminated and in its place would be the drawing submitted by B. Parker.

There was some confusion as to where the stop sign would actually be placed. It would be placed on Putnam Street, for the drivers traveling on that road. Chief Douglas noted, in police reports, the first street mentioned is where the stop sign is located; in this situation, Putnam and Middle Streets, the sign would be on Putnam Street.

B. Ruoff said it would be a good idea for the two (2) bump outs and the more refined parking spaces. He thought they should paint the spots closer to Putnam Street so they are narrower and would force smaller cars to park in those spots.

K. Lynch thought that would be a good idea, to make the spots more unified since there are several sizes of spots there.

M. Putnam felt they should be consistent with the spacing.

F. Douglas noted this would be enforceable because the Town of Milford parking ordinance states people "must park between the lines"; if they do not, they will be ticketed. He also stated if they shrink some of the parking spaces, it must be reasonable.

There was some discussion on the width of parking spaces. B. Parker stated they are 10'x18' in mall parking lots and 9'x18' every place else and there is between one hundred ninety (190) and two hundred (200) feet to work with and at the most, they would be losing one (1) space with the installation of the bump out.

B. Ruoff noted the bump out would be installed to move Putnam Street drivers out more to be able to see better and the parallel parking would move a bit toward the Oval.

B. Parker noted both would increase the sight distance.

K. Lynch noted, from the accident information included in the meeting packet, that accidents are low in that area.

F. Douglas noted they can not calculate near misses and they are trying to be proactive and not reactive. He noted, at times, that area is very busy and with Fire and Ambulance, that situation is made worse. He noted they would be using Option II from the last meeting and leaving the parking as 90 degree parking.

#### OPTION II

- Install 'Stop' Sign and two possible "bump outs" at intersection on Middle Street and Putnam Street:
  - Increase in sight alignment
  - Enhanced public safety for motorists and pedestrians at intersection
  - Fits criteria of Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)
    - Page 41, STOP sign applications sections A, B, C and D
  - Intersection enhancements may be coverage by already acquired grant monies
  - Crosswalk is contained with the intersection, public safety concern
  - Ninety degree intersection, public safety concern
  - Emergency service location (Ambulance Bay), public safety concern
  - Fire Department emergency response at various times, public safety concern
  - Heavy traffic flow at peak times to avoid Nashua Street, public safety concern
  - No engineer study has been completed on this intersection
  - No accident data supporting safety issue
  - Many reports of "near misses" at intersection

G. Archambault made the motion to accept this option in place of the compact car option.

B. Ruoff seconded the option and all were in favor.

B. Parker reiterated that money from the Gregg Grant would be available for the improvements.

F. Douglas stated this would increase sight alignment looking both east and west and should decrease the number of near misses. There would also be a continued free flow of traffic and the parking pattern will not change and neither will the existing crosswalk.

M. Putnam suggested the committee vote to see how members felt about each option.

F. Douglas asked if there was any interest in the other two (2) options for Middle and Putnam Streets. There was no interest in either option so Option II was made into Option I and it would be noted that the Committee recommends this option due to safety concerns.

## *2. Discussion: Finalize submission to BOS.*

M. Putnam began by noting the preference for this area is drawn on the map submitted by B. Parker. He recommended moving parking spaces up about two (2) feet to the edge of the existing crosswalk across Bridge Street. He noted he had looked at wear patterns on the pavement and was noticing there would be space on the bridge if the parking spaces were moved up about two (2) feet. Across from the Bridge Street sidewalk, the area is a no parking area and would provide some additional sight distance; planters and curbing could be added as well. He felt drivers could see between thirty (30) and forty (40) feet very easily. His concern with moving the crosswalk to the Amherst Street intersection, there would be too many distractions for drivers to deal with. With this option, there would be no loss of parking spaces and there would be good visibility to the north and south.

B. Parker agreed and stated there would be money in the Gregg Grant for these improvements.

M. Putnam stated both Tim Finan and Kathy Bauer, selectmen, were also in agreement that this was a better spot for the crosswalk as well.

F. Douglas stated after looking at this option, he was willing to change his vote. He asked if there was any additional input. He asked if this option does not go through the BOS, if they wanted to have another viable option to fall back on. He stated his concern was if a large truck was parked in the angle spots south of the new crosswalk, it would cut into the visibility of the crosswalk.

G. Archambault noted recently he had to stop to let cars pass by on the narrow section of the Oval before the bridge and was concerned by the addition of a crosswalk there.

B. Courage felt that was too busy an area to have the crosswalk there; there was a lot to look for without the crosswalk being there, which is the same issue as pedestrians walking out from behind cars at the current crosswalk. He noted the proposed crosswalk is not far from the existing crosswalk in front of Hometown Insurance.

M. Putnam replied he was concerned if there was room enough for the construction of the ADA crosswalk at the Amherst Street intersection.

B. Parker asked if B. Courage was suggesting they either remove the existing crosswalk or move it to the Amherst Street intersection.

B. Courage replied the crosswalk should go at the Amherst Street intersection.

M. Putnam noted accident data was not included in the packet for this area.

F. Douglas replied it was higher at this intersection than on Middle Street, mainly because people do not use their directional signal.

B. Ruoff made the motion to table this discussion until he could get the chance to look at the areas in question to make certain the crosswalks can be constructed there. He did note, at the controlled intersection at the Post Office, there was no crosswalk and that people have to cross up by the Rite Aid to get to the Post Office; he was in favor of putting the crosswalk there.

K. Lynch stated he thought there was future renovation slated for that area.

B. Parker replied that is a few years off but they could do something there in the meantime, as a short term solution.

F. Douglas stated in the future proposals, there was a recommendation to make Middle Street a one way but he recommended they not consider that, since it may not happen.  
B. Courage replied he wanted this discussion to have a conclusion and the problems have a solution.  
M. Putnam felt there was not enough attention paid to the intersection by drivers and was concerned the added crosswalk would make problems worse.  
B. Parker felt adding the crosswalk at Amherst Street might add to the confusion that already exists there; there may be confusion as to who has the right of way when pedestrians are thrown into the mix.  
F. Douglas stated confusion is good at times in traffic analysis; it may make people more aware of the difficult intersection and pay more attention. He stated South Street, a very narrow street, has one of the lowest accident records in town; people are aware of the problem and take it into consideration.  
G. Archambault thought the Bridge Street crosswalk would be too long and the area too narrow for such a thing; these would be two (2) strong negatives for that area.  
F. Douglas thought a pedestrian sign in the middle of the crosswalk would be a good thing and would provide additional control.  
K. Lynch and G. Archambault agreed that the sign would slow down traffic.  
F. Douglas asked if there was a second to B. Ruoff's motion to table this item until he gets a chance to look at the areas in question.  
B. Courage seconded the motion.  
B. Parker stated he was unable to vote at this time; he wasn't convinced that was the better solution.  
B. Ruoff suggested they approve the Bridge Street option as presented by M. Putnam.  
K. Lynch made the motion to accept M. Putnam's suggestion.  
B. Courage seconded the motion.  
All were in favor; none were opposed.  
There was some discussion on an additional spot for a crosswalk. No one agreed to further pursue the new option.  
F. Douglas asked if the committee wanted to commit to one option and asked if there was a motion to approve the crosswalk at Bridge Street.  
B. Ruoff made the motion; K. Lynch seconded the motion.  
K. Lynch, B. Ruoff, M. Putnam and B. Parker were in favor.  
F. Douglas, B. Courage and G. Archambault opposed.  
The recommendation passed by majority vote.  
F. Douglas stated he and K. Parenti would write a memo for submission for the BOS meeting on June 23.

### *3. Discussion: Election of Officers*

F. Douglas stated due to the lateness of the hour, they would table this item until the next meeting.  
All were in agreement.

### *4. Approval of minutes from April 28 and May 19, 2008.*

F. Douglas asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes from April 28, 2008.  
B. Ruoff made the motion to approve the minutes as printed.  
B. Parker seconded the motion.  
All were in favor; K. Lynch abstained.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:50.